

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-19 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 2-3, and 5-10; cancels Claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer; and adds new Claims 11-19 without introducing any new matter.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, Claim 1 is canceled and rewritten as new independent Claim 11. Specifically, Claim 11 more clearly recites the relationships between the actuators and the electric motors, as well as the relationship between the electronic control unit and the servo-control devices. In Claim 11, the first electric motor drives the first control actuator unit, and the second electric motor drives the second control actuator unit. Claim 11 is thus consistent with Fig. 2, which shows a first electric motor 14a driving a first control actuator unit 12 (see the upper branch of the diagram), and the second electric motor 14b driving a second control actuator unit 12 (see the lower branch of the diagram). Claim 11 is not limited to three actuators in the control actuator units since this exemplary embodiment shown in Fig. 1 is non-limiting. See e.g., page 4, lines 23-25, lines 34-35 and page 5, line 35.¹ Claim 11 further recites that the first electronic control unit *comprises* the first servo-control device configured to control the displacement of the first door, and the second electronic control unit *comprises* a second servo-control device configured to control the displacement of the second door. Claim 11 is thus further consistent with Fig. 2, which shows the first electronic control unit 18a comprising its servo-control device and the second electronic control unit 18b comprising its

¹ Further, the specification does not state that having three actuators per door is required or essential.

servo-control device. The dependent claims are amended for consistency. In view of the amended claims, it is believed that all pending claims are definite and fully supported by the original disclosure and no further rejections on these bases are anticipated. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

In order to vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, new dependent Claims 12-19 are added. New Claims 12-19 find non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, for example at page 5, lines 23-30; page 6, lines 9-37; page 7, lines 1-16; and Figs. 1-2. Therefore, the changes to the claims are not believed to raise a question of new matter.²

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 2-19 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

² See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."